

REMARKS

In the November 28, 2007 Office Action, claims 1-3, 5-18, and 21-25 stand rejected in view of prior art, while claim 5 was objected to for improper dependency. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

Status of Claims and Amendments

In response to the November 28, 2007 Office Action, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections. Thus, claims 1-3, 5-18, and 21-25 are pending, with claims 1, 12, 21, and 25 being the only independent claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of the following comments.

Claim Objections

On page 2 of the Office Action, claim 5 was objected to because claim 5 depended from a canceled claim. Applicants have amended claim 5 to depend from claim 1. Applicants respectfully assert that claim 5 is now correct. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

On pages 2-7 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 5-8, 12, 13, 15, 21, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,527,372 (Choi et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003-01935339 (Umetani et al.), U.S. Patent No. 6,843,548 (Arakawa et al.), and U.S. Patent No. 5,502,467 (Hoisington et al.). On pages 7 and 8 of the Office Action, claims 3 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi et al. in view of Umetani et al., Arakawa et al., Hoisington et al., and U.S. Patent No. 6,257,687 (Iwamura). On pages 8-10 of the Office Action, claims 9, 11, 16, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi et al. in view

of Umetani et al., Arakawa et al., Hoisington et al, and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002-0005873 (Suzuki). On pages 10 and 11 of the Office Action, claims 10 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi et al. in view of Umetani et al., Arakawa et al., Hoisington et al, and U.S. Patent No. 6,488,349 (Matsuo). On pages 11 and 12 of the Office Action, claims 22 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi et al. in view of Umetani et al., Arakawa et al., Hoisington et al, and U.S. Patent No. 6,998,230 (Schantz). Further, on pages 12 and 13 of the Office Action, claim 24 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi et al. in view of Umetani et al., Arakawa et al., Hoisington et al, and International Patent Publication No. WO02/090119 (Weksler). In response, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

More specifically, claim 1 of the Application recites that a physical property value acquisition section is configured and arranged to acquire physical property values of *the droplets discharged from the discharge head*.

Hoisington et al. were cited in the Office Action to show the physical property value acquisition section and a measuring section. However, as disclosed in column 1, lines 33-38, the viscosity of the ink supplied to the orifices *in the ink jet printhead* is detected, unlike the present invention.

Choi et al. were cited in the Office Action to show a storage section, a waveform adjusting section, a basic drive waveform storage section, a discharge hear, and a basic drive waveform storage. Umetani et al. were cited in the Office Action to show a weight measuring section, an electrode, an oscillator, a frequency counter. Arakawa was cited in the Office Action to show a speed measuring section and the speed measuring section computing the velocity of the droplets. Iwamura was cited in the Office Action to show a waveform-adjusting section. Suzuki was cited in the Office Action to show that the waveform-adjusting

section changes the drive waveform by using at least one of an early electric potential VC, an electric potential VH, and an electric potential VL, and that the waveform adjusting section determines the electric potential and the early electric potential VH. Matsuo et al. were cited in the Office Action to show that the waveform-determining section determines a hold time to maintain the electric potential VL. Shantz was cited in the Office Action to show an electronic equipment. Weksler was cited in the Office Action to show that the speed measuring section has a camera and a strobe light.

Applicants respectfully assert that this arrangement is *not* disclosed or suggested by Choi et al., Umetani et al., Arakawa, Hoisington et al. or any other prior art of record. It is well settled in U.S. patent law that the mere fact that the prior art can be modified does *not* make the modification obvious, unless the prior art provides an *apparent reason* for the desirability of the modification. Accordingly, the prior art of record lacks any apparent reason, suggestion or expectation of success for combining the patents to create the Applicants' unique arrangement of the drive waveform-determining device.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that none of the prior art of record realized benefit of measuring the physical property values of the droplets discharged from the discharge head. Therefore, Applicants respectfully asserts that none of the references nor any combination thereof makes the present invention obvious.

As claims 12, 21, and 25 similarly recite, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 12, 21, and 25 are allowable for the same or similar reasons stated above.

Moreover, Applicants believe that the dependent claims 2, 3, 5-11, 13-18, 22-24 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claim 1, 12, 21, and 25 and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Also, the dependent claims 2, 3, 5-11, 13-18, 22-24 are further allowable because they include additional

Appl. No. 10/783,094
Amendment dated February 28, 2008
Reply to Office Action of November 28, 2007

limitations. Thus, Applicants believe that since the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest the invention as set forth in independent claim 1, 12, 21, and 25, the prior art of record also fails to disclose or suggest the inventions as set forth in the dependent claims.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn in view of the above comments and amendments.

* * *

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1-3, 5-18, and 21-25 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Akiyoshi Onda /
Akiyoshi Onda
Limited Recognition No. L0336

GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
(202)-293-0444
Dated: February 28, 2008

S:\02-FEB08-AO\SE-US035203 Amendment.doc